

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the application mailed on November 12, 2003, and as designated and confirmed on the postcard (a copy of which is attached to this reply), applicant filed a patent application with the U.S. patent office including 10 pages of Specification, 4 pages of Claims and 1 page of Abstract, and including one set of Informal Drawings containing Figures 1–8. Copies of the Claims and the Drawings included in the initial filing of this patent application are also attached. In the Office Action of June 17, 2004, the Examiner objected to the drawings *submitted on March 1, 2004*, specifically Figures 7 and 8, stating that they should be designated by a legend such as –Prior Art–. Furthermore, the Office Action Summary indicates that only claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

Applicant must first bring to the attention of the Examiner that the informal drawings that were filed with the original application include the legend –Prior Art– on Figures 7 and 8. Furthermore, a total of 17 claims (claims 1-17) were filed with the original application. Applicant's file indicates that a Certified Copy of the Priority Document, along with a Verification and English Translation of the Priority Document, were filed on February 24, 2004 and received by the Patent Office on March 01, 2004. Applicant proposes that the Examiner reviewed the drawings and claims from one or both of these documents, instead of the original documents that were filed on November 12, 2003.

In the Office Action of June 17, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 5,879,169 (“Wu”) in view of US patent 6,231,394 (“Schnell”). Insofar as the disclosure of We, the Examiner stated that “*Wu does not disclose the recesses being for receiving the soldering tail nor at least one side of inner walls of the accepting recess having an interference portion for holding the soldering tail.*” The Examiner then states that “*Schnell discloses an insulated housing 12 having recesses 30 for receiving soldering tail 16.6 and at least one side of inner walls of the accepting recess having an interference portion (not shown, see col. 4, lines 40-45) for holding the soldering tail.*” And that “*it would have been obvious...to modify the card connector of Wu...as taught by Schnell*”. Furthermore, with respect to claims 2 and 3 (which do not necessarily correspond to the claims as filed), the Examiner goes on to state that “*since the housing body (of Schnell) corresponds to the shape of the contacts, see col. 4, lines 46-50, the interference portion is shaped as semi-cylinder, and horizontally extends from the inner wall of the accepting recess, the middle of the accepting recess is provided with an elevated platform for being pressed against by the soldering tail.*” Applicant has read and reread the passages referenced by the Examiner (above)

and can find no reference to an interference portion of a terminal accepting recess that is allegedly disclosed in Schnell. Nor can applicant find reference to either the rounded engaging surfaces of the interfering portions (current claim 4), or the elevated platform of the holding slots (current claim 5) of Schnell. Applicant invites the Examiner to more closely read Schnell and more specifically point out to applicant where such features are either shown or described.

In view of the foregoing comments, reconsideration of the application, in the form of a new Office Action or allowance of claims 1-17, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: _____

By: _____
Stacey E. Caldwell
Registration No.: 36,917
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:
Stacey E. Caldwell
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-2665
Fax: (630) 416-4962